



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,529	04/20/2001	Andrew Hausman	3524/33	2141
29858	7590	03/31/2005		
BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP				
900 THIRD AVENUE				
NEW YORK, NY 10022				

EXAMINER	
FULTS, RICHARD C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/839,529	Applicant(s) HAUSMAN, ANDREW	
	Examiner Richard Fults	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2005/3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 1-17 and 46-50 are rejected under USC 101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The word "network" can mean a manual verbal network. For a claim to be statutory under 35 USC 101 the following two conditions must be met:

1) In the claim, the practical application of an algorithm or idea results in a useful, concrete, tangible result,

AND

2) The claim provides a limitation in the technological arts that enables a useful, concrete, tangible result.

As to the technology requirement, note MPEP Section IV 2(b). Also note *In re Waldbaum*, 173USPQ 430 (CCPA 1972) which teaches "useful arts" is synonymous with "technological arts". In *Musgrave*, 167USPQ 280 (CCPA 1970), *In re Johnston*, 183USPQ 172 (CCPA 1974), and *In re Toma*, 197USPQ 852 (CCPA 1978), all teach a technological requirement.

The invention **in the body of the claim** must recite technology. If the invention in the body of the claim is not tied to technological art, environment, or machine, the claim is not statutory. *Ex parte Bowman* 61USPQ2d 1665, 1671 (BD. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001) (Unpublished).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien et al (US 5,101,353 A), hereinafter Lupien.

Lupien discloses (see at least columns 1-18, but in particular columns 1-6) all the methods, systems, and products described in claims 1-50, including a method for electronic trading of interests with a reserve over a network or networks, receiving terms for a total desired trade of interests, an initial quantity, and a reserve quantity, associating with said desired trade a reserve price change, disclosing terms of a first proposed trade of said interests to others via a network, said terms for a first proposed trades comprising an identification of said interests, said initial price, and said initial quantity, and upon acceptance of said first proposed trade disclosing terms of a second proposed trade of said interests to others via a network, said terms for a second proposed trade comprising an identification of said interests, a second price, and a second quantity, said second price being equal to said initial price changed by said reserve price change, and said second quantity comprising at least a portion of said reserve quantity. Lupien does not discuss commodity contracts.

However, the basic concept behind trading securities vs commodity contracts regarding the marketplace problems of too large a quantity in a single order weighing on the market with respect to price is identical between the two markets. Given this fact, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to know that this concept of spreading out a large transaction offering would apply equally well to the commodities market.

Art Unit: 3628

3. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to automate the old and well known practice of spreading out buy and sell order quantities to avoid price disruption in the marketplace due to the large quantity of securities in the order, by offering in the market only a part of the total order at a time and then offering the remaining parts at possibly different prices, but only after the first portion transaction has been completed, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Fults whose telephone number is 703-305-5416. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 to 5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough, can be reached on (703)-305-0505. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326 before final and 703-872-9327 after final.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



RCF

3/8/2005



HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600